UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/014,602	12/14/2001	Oran Uzrad-Nali	Q66695	2020

23373 7590 07/18/2006

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER	
ENGLAND, DAVID E	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2143	

DATE MAILED: 07/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/014,602	UZRAD-NALI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David E. England	2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 May 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-9,12-24,27-56 and 59-97* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-9,12-24,27-56 and 59-97* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DL

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 9, 12 – 24, 27 – 56, and 59 – 79 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 76 and 77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

4. The limitation of "an intelligent network interface card" and "wherein said data is not moved between memory location of the intelligent network interface card", is not disclosed in any part of the specification. Applicant is asked to amend the claim language to state what the true nature of the invention is.

5. Claim 77 states, "queuing a transmission information respective of said data in a transmission queue without further movement of said data in memory." The specification does not state how this is possible. In fact it appears to be impossible. In order to "queue information" one has to move it from one memory location to the queue in order for it to be considered

"queued". Applicant is asked to amend the claim language or explain while using the specification and drawings.

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

8. In claim 3, it is unclear in the specification how said host computer is used "solely" for "initializing the networked system". Applicant is asked to point to sections of the specification and drawing to support their arguments.

9. Claim 6 is rejected for its dependency on claim 3.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

11. Claims 1 – 5, 7 – 9, 12 – 17, 19 – 24, 28, 29, 37, 44 – 49, 51, 53 – 56, 78 and 79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Roach et al. U.S. Patent No. 6314100, (hereinafter Roach).

12. Referencing claim 1, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Roach teaches a packet-based networked system comprising:

13. a host computer, (e.g., col. 3, lines 36 – 60);

14. a data streamer connected to said host computer, said data streamer capable of transferring packet data between said host and networked resources using a memory within said data streamer without moving the data between memory locations within the memory during processing by said data streamer, (e.g., col. 6, line 35 – col. 7, line 25 & col. 7, lines 37 – 67, "pointers and storing data on a buffer with available space");

15. a communication link connecting said data streamer and networked resources, (e.g., col. 8, lines 11 – 41).

16. Referencing claim 2, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Roach teaches said communication link is a dedicated communication link, (e.g., col. 1, lines 31 – 40).

17. Referencing claim 3, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Roach teaches said host computer is used solely for initializing the network system, (e.g., col. 1, line 58 – col. 2, line 10, *"PVC"*).

18. Referencing claim 4, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Roach teaches the networked resources include networked storage devices, (e.g., col. 8, lines 16 – 56).

19. Referencing claim 5, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Roach teaches the dedicated communication link is a network communication link, (e.g., col. 1, line 58 – col. 2, line 10, *"PVC"*).

20. Referencing claim 7, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Roach teaches the network communication link is at least one of:

21. a local area network (LAN) link, a wide area network, (e.g., col. 1, lines 31 – 40).

22. Referencing claim 8, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Roach teaches the network communication is based on at least one of:

23. Ethernet, Internet protocol (IP), asynchronous transfer mode (ATM) protocol, (e.g., col. 2, lines 10 – 19).

24. Referencing claim 9, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Roach said data streamer is configured to relieve said host from at least upper level protocol (UPL) processing, (e.g., col. 4, lines 36 – 49).

25. Referencing claim 12, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Roach teaches

26. at least one host interface, interfacing with said host computer, (e.g., col. 1, line 58 – col. 2, line 10);

27. at least one packet network interface, enabling the interfacing with a plurality of networked resources, (e.g., col. 1, line 58 – col. 2, line 10);

28. at least one processing node, capable of generating additional data and commands necessary for packet network layer operations, (e.g., col. 4, lines 36 – 67);

29. an admission and classification unit that initially processes the data, (e.g., col. 1, line 58 – col. 2, line 10);

30. an event queue manager that supports processing of the data, (e.g., col. 5, lines 21 – 65, *"manager engine"*);

31. a scheduler that supports processing of the data, (e.g., col. 5, lines 21 – 65, *"PENG"*);

32. a memory manager that manages the memory, (e.g., col. col. 5, lines 21 – 65, *"PENG"*);

33. a data interconnect unit that receives the data from said admission and classification unit, (e.g., col. 5, lines 48 – 58); and

34. a control hub, (e.g., col. 5, lines 48 – 58).

35. Referencing claim 13, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Roach teaches said processing node is further connected to an expansion memory, (e.g., col. 8, lines 30 – 56).

36. Referencing claim 14, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Roach teaches said expansion memory is a code memory, (e.g., col. 8, lines 30 – 56).

37. Referencing claim 22, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Roach teaches said event queue manager is capable of managing at least:

38. an object queue, (e.g., col. 7, lines 1 – 19); and

39. an application queue, (e.g., col. 7, lines 1 – 19).

40. Referencing claim 23, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Roach teaches said object queue points to a first descriptor while a first header is processed, (e.g., col. 5, lines 32 – 47).

41. Referencing claim 24, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Roach teaches a header of data processed is in one of:

42. a second communication layer, third communication layer, fourth communication layer, fifth communication layer, (e.g., col. 7, lines 37 – 67).

43. Referencing claim 28, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Roach teaches said object queue holds at least a start address to the header information, (e.g., col. col. 7, lines 37 – 67).

44. Referencing claim 29, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Roach teaches said object queue hold at least a end address to the header information, (e.g., col. col. 7, lines 37 – 67).

45. Referencing claim 37, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Roach teaches the system is adapted to receive at least one packet of data with headers from a network resource and

opening a new descriptor if the headers do not belong to a previously opened descriptor, (e.g., col. 7, lines 1 – 19).

46. Claims 15 – 17, 19 – 21, 44 – 49, 51, 53 – 56, 78 and 79 are rejected for similar reasons stated above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

47. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

48. Claims 6, 18, 50 and 77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roach in view of Starr et al. U.S. Patent No. 6807581, (hereinafter Starr).

49. Referencing claim 6, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Roach does not specifically teach the dedicated communication link is selected from a group consisting of personal computer interface (PCI), PCI-X, 3GIO, lnfiniBand, SP1-3, or SPI-4. Starr teaches the dedicated communication link is selected from a group consisting of personal computer interface (PCI), PCI-X, 3GIO, lnfiniBand, SP1-3, or SPI-4, (e.g., col. 2, lines 21 – 49). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Starr

with Roach because utilizing a PCI is well known in the computer arts and is used in communicating information to and from computers and other devices.

50. Referencing claim 77, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Starr teaches a method for transferring application data from a host computer to a packet based network resource via an intelligent network interface card, the method comprising:

51. a) receiving data from the host computer, (e.g., col. 2, lines 21 – 62 & col. 7, lines 23 – 42);

52. b) receiving destination address from the host computer, (e.g., col. 2, lines 21 – 62 & col. 7, lines 23 – 42);

53. c) queuing a transmission information respective of said data in a transmission queue, (e.g., col. 2, lines 21 – 62 & col. 7, lines 23 – 42);

54. d) updating a descriptor pointing to portion of said data to be sent next, (e.g., col. 25, line 54 – col. 26, line 37);

55. e) creating headers for the transmission, (e.g., col. 2, lines 21 – 62 & col. 7, lines 23 – 42);

56. f) transmitting the portion of said data to be sent next, beginning at the point pointed to by said descriptor, and respective headers over the network, (e.g., col. 2, lines 21 – 62 & col. 7, lines 23 – 42);

57. g) repeating steps d through f until all of the application data is sent, (e.g., col. 2, lines 21 – 62 & col. 7, lines 23 – 42); and

58. h) indicating to the host computer that transfer is complete, (e.g., col. 2, lines 21 – 62 & col. 7, lines 23 – 42).

59. Roach more specifically teaches,

60. c) queuing a transmission information respective of said data in a transmission queue without further movement of said data in memory, (e.g., col. 6, line 35 – col. 7, line 25 & col. 7, lines 37 – 67);

61. wherein said data is not moved between memory locations of the intelligent network interface card, (e.g., col. 6, line 35 – col. 7, line 25 & col. 7, lines 37 – 67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Starr with Roach because utilizing pointers in a system instead of copying information could save memory space in a system.

62. Claims 18 and 50 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

63. Claims 30 – 36, 38 – 43 and 60 – 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roach in view of Fishler et al. U.S. Patent No. 5954794 (hereinafter Fishler).

64. Referencing claim 30, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Roach does not specifically teach said application queue points to said first descriptor instead of said object queue if at least an application header is available. Fishler teaches said application queue points to said first descriptor instead of said object queue if at least an application header is available, (e.g., col. 3, lines 38 – 55 & col. 8, line 43 – col. 9, line 39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Fishler with Roach because it would be more efficient for a system that utilizes two different object queues to operate separate pointers so only information pertaining to that queue is stored in said queue.

65. Referencing claim 31, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Roach does not specifically teach said first descriptor points at least to a beginning of the application header. Fishler teaches said first descriptor points at least to a beginning of the application header, (e.g., col. 3, lines 38 – 55 & col. 8, line 43 – col. 9, line 39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Fishler with Roach because of similar reasons stated above.

66. Referencing claim 32, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Roach does not specifically teach said application queue maintains address of said beginning of the application header. Fishler teaches said application queue maintains address of said beginning of the application header, (e.g., col. 3, lines 38 – 55 & col. 8, line 43 – col. 9, line 39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Fishler with Roach because of similar reasons stated above.

67. Referencing claim 33, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Roach does not specifically teach said first descriptor points at least to an end of said application header. Fishler teaches said first descriptor points at least to an end of said application header, (e.g., col. 3, lines 38 – 55 & col. 8, line 43 – col. 9, line 39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention was made to combine Fishler with Roach because of similar reasons stated above.

68. Referencing claim 34, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Roach does not specifically teach said application queue maintains address of said end of said application header. Fishler teaches said application queue maintains address of said end of said application header, (e.g., col. 3, lines 38 – 55 & col. 8, line 43 – col. 9, line 39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Fishler with Roach because of similar reasons stated above.

69. Referencing claim 35, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Roach does not specifically teach when all application headers are available, data is transferred to said host computer in a continuous operation. Fishler teaches when all application headers are available, data is transferred to said host computer in a continuous operation, (e.g., col. 3, lines 38 – 55 & col. 8, line 43 – col. 9, line 39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Fishler with Roach because of similar reasons stated above.

70. Referencing claim 36, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Roach does not specifically teach said continuous operation is based on pointer information stored in said application queue. Fishler teaches said continuous operation is based on pointer information stored in said application queue, (e.g., col. 3, lines 38 – 55 & col. 8, line 43 – col. 9, line 39). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Fishler with Roach because of similar reasons stated above.

71. Referencing claim 39, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Roach does not specifically teach the system is adapted to transfer control of the descriptor to the application queue if at least one application header is available and is further adapted to store a start and end address of the application header in the application queue. Fishler teaches the system is adapted to transfer control of the descriptor to the application queue if at least one application header is available and is further adapted to store a start and end address of the application header in the application queue, (e.g., col. 3, lines 38 – 55 & col. 8, line 43 – col. 9, line 39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Fishler with Roach because of similar reasons stated above.

72. Referencing claim 40, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Roach does not specifically teach the system is adapted to transfer the data to the host based on the stored application headers. Fishler teaches the system is adapted to transfer the data to the host based on the stored application headers, (e.g., col. 3, lines 38 – 55 & col. 8, line 43 – col. 9, line 39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Fishler with Roach because of similar reasons stated above.

73. Referencing claim 42, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Roach does not specifically teach the system is adapted to update an earlier created descriptor to point to a portion of the data

that is to be sent next. Fishler teaches the system is adapted to update an earlier created descriptor to point to a portion of the data that is to be sent next, (e.g., col. 3, lines 38 – 55 & col. 8, line 43 – col. 9, line 39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Fishler with Roach because of similar reasons stated above.

74. Claims 38, 41, 43 and 60 – 76 are rejected for similar reasons stated above.

75. Claims 20, 27, 52 and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roach as applied to claims 1, 22 and 23 above, and further in view of Muller et al. (6453360), (hereinafter Muller).

76. As per claim 27, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Roach does not specifically teach said object queue points to a second descriptor if a second header has a same tuple corresponding to the first header. Muller teaches said object queue points to a second descriptor if a second header has a same tuple corresponding to the first header, (e.g., col. 25, lines 16 – 27). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was filed, to combine Muller with Starr because if the second header "tuple" or address is different then the first address there could be an error in addressing the packet to a specific user, therefore, the system would have to send an error message to the sending node to notify the sending node about the error so it can be remedied.

77. Claims 20, 52 and 59 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Response to Arguments

78. Applicant's arguments filed 05/02/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

79. In the Remarks, Applicant argues in substance that the 112 rejection in reference to the limitation of "solely" is referred to paragraph 0071 of the Applicant's specification. In which, the Applicant respectfully submit that the word solely refers to the fact that after the initial configuration of the system, the system is capable of operating without intervention of the host computer, i.e., between any nodes of the network.

80. As to part 1, the paragraph that the Applicant reference's does not state that "solely" is to be interpreted as such. When Applicant states that a host computer has one "sole" operation, that means that the host computer can do nothing else. This is not the case in the specification. There is nothing in the claim language that would suggest the Applicant's meaning as stated in paragraph 0071. Applicant is asked to amend the claim language to reflect the true meaning of the claim limitation.

81. In the Remarks, Applicant argues in substance that Roach does not disclose a packet based network system due to the frame based operation of Fiber Channel systems. Moreover, nothing in Roach teaches that data is not moved between locations, and even the Examiner points

to column 7 lines 37 – 67 were the use of buffers with available space is specifically mentioned. That means that data is moved to temporary storage locations prior to being moved to a permanent location.

82. As to part 2, Examiner would like to point out to the Applicant that the definition of "frame", as stated in the "Newton's Telecom Dictionary", "A frame IS a packet." Anybody of ordinary skill in the art knows that a frame and a packet utilize the same type of features. Furthermore, the definition of "packet" is "Generic term for a bundle of data, usually in binary form, organized in a specific way for transmission.

83. As to Roach not teaching that data is not moved between locations, Roach teaches pointers that are utilized in communication. Utilizing pointers would mean that information does not have to be moved it is referenced and therefore reads on the claim languages.

84. In the Remarks, Applicant argues in substance that Roach does not teach the limitations of claim 3.

85. As to part 3, Applicant is asked to view the first response to their Remarks, for it also holds the same weight here.

86. In the Remarks, Applicant argues in substance that Roach does not teach the claim limitation of claim 5. Moreover, Fiber Channel link does not poses nor support the network routing protocols and algorithms required for the necessary level of operation used in the network configuration of the Application.

87. As to part 4, in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., routing protocols and algorithms required for the necessary level of operation used in the network configuration of the Application) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

88. In the Remarks, Applicant argues in substance that while Roach discusses LAN and WAN, no teaching in respect of the disclosed invention is made, nor does Roach suggest to connect a LAN or WAN and in fact notes that "Features of both channels and networks have been incorporated into... Fiber Channel." (column 1, lines 41 – 43). It is not shown at this point that features of a LAN or a WAN have any impact or connection to the Roach system.

89. As to part 5, when reviewing a reference the applicants should remember that not only the specific teachings of a reference but also reasonable inferences which the artisan would have logically drawn therefrom may be properly evaluated in formulating a rejection. In re Preda, 401 F. 2d 825, 159 USPQ 342 (CCPA 1968) and In re Shepard, 319 F. 2d 194, 138 USPQ 148 (CCPA 1963). Skill in the art is presumed. In re Sovish, 769 F. 2d 738, 226 USPQ 771 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Furthermore, artisans must be presumed to know something about the art apart from what the references disclose. In re Jacoby, 309 F. 2d 513, 135 USPQ 317 (CCPA 1962). The conclusion of obviousness may be made from common knowledge and common sense of a person of ordinary skill in the art without any specific hint or suggestion in a particular reference. In re Bozek, 416 F.2d 1385, 163 USPQ 545 (CCPA 1969). Every reference relies to some extent

on knowledge of persons skilled in the art to complement that which is disclosed therein. In re Bode, 550 F. 2d 656, 193 USPQ 12 (CCPA 1977).

90. Furthermore, in the next Remark Applicant admits that Roach teaches the connection to a LAN. Which is stated in column 2. Also, it is well known in the art, to anybody of skill, that a Fiber Channel can be incorporated to LANs and WANs.

91. In the Remarks, Applicant argues in substance that Roach does not teach the limitations of claim 8.

92. As to part 6, if the Applicant were to draw their attention to the Abstract, it is stated that "the invention is particularly useful for processing TCP/**IP** frames in a Fiber Channel network." This along with what was previously cited, teaches the claim language.

93. In the Remarks, Applicant argues in substance that Roach does not teach the limitations of claim 9, 12, 22 – 24, and all other claims under the 102 rejection. Furthermore, Applicant states that the prior art of Starr, Fishler and Muller do not teach the remanding claims.

94. As to part 7, Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

95. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 76 – 79 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

96. Applicant is advised to contact the Examiner for any further clarifications and to further prosecution.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E. England whose telephone number is 571-272-3912. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

David E. England
Examiner
Art Unit 2143

DE

DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100